



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,455	02/20/2004	Gerald E. Hancock	ACY33,386 D1	1506
25291	7590	06/13/2007	EXAMINER	
WYETH			HILL, MYRON G	
PATENT LAW GROUP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5 GIRALDA FARMS			1648	
MADISON, NJ 07940				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/13/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/783,455	HANCOCK ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Myron G. Hill	1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 9,12-14,41-43 and 51-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 43 and 56-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9,12-14,41,42 and 51-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/20/04</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Election/Restrictions***

Claims 43 and 56-60 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10/27/06.

Claims 9, 12-14, 41, 42, and 51-55 with elected SEQ ID# 19 are under consideration.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

A signed and initialed copy of the IDS filed 2/20/04 is enclosed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9, 12-14, 41, 42, and 51-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for two nucleic acid sequences of mutants of SEQ ID# 19, does not reasonably provide enablement for all variants having the recited function of not causing enhanced disease in a vertebrate or vectored constructs. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims are evaluated for scope of enablement based on the Wands analysis. Many of the factors regarding undue experimentation have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed.Circ.1988) as follows:

(1) the nature of the invention, (2) the state of the prior art, (3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, (4) the amount of direction or guidance present, (5) the presence or absence of working examples, (6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (7) the relative skill of those in the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The invention is drawn to peptides that do not induce enhanced disease upon infection with RSV and the claims encompass any variant sequence of claim 19. The prior art teaches that discloses the enhanced disease and immunological responses caused by it.

The specification asserts that changes in the CTL motif located in the region of residues 184-192 will eliminate eosinophilia (page 29, line 22).

The prior art teaches that there are variants between strains and sub groups A and B of RSV (Fig. 2 in Johnson *et al.* PNAS 1987, Vol. 84, pages 5625-5629). The Sub group B virus, strain 18537, has an alteration in the K residue that corresponds to the 187 residue in SEQ ID# 19 that alters the motif as defined on page 29, line 22.

Specification provides guidance and direction to two mutants of SEQ ID# 19 (Figure 6) with 3 or 4 changes per peptide.

The specification does not show a range of single mutations that have the function or combinations of two or more.

The specification only teaches the mutants in the form of peptides, not nucleic acid used for inoculation.

The claims also encompass vectored vaccines. Murphy *et al.* (Virus Research 1994, Vol 32, pages 13-36) teach that vectored RSV vaccines are not immunogenic in chimpanzees. There is no showing in the specification that the current invention is immunogenic when administered as a nucleic acid containing vector.

The enabling disclosure is clearly not commensurate in scope with these claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Without specific guidance or direction and /or working examples, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to reproducibly practice the entire scope of the invention as claimed by making altered G sequences that do not cause enhanced disease and use the nucleic acid in a vector to immunize, without undue experimentation.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear in part c) if portions (a) and (b) are under the control of one regulatory sequence or if a regulatory sequence is linked to both.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9, 12-14, 41, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Johnson et al.*

The claims are drawn to an RSV G protein or peptide with an altered sequence.

*Johnson et al.* teach the Sub group B virus, strain 18537, has an alteration in the K residue that corresponds to the 187 residue in SEQ ID# 19 that alters the motif as defined on page 29, line 22.

While the prior art does not disclose it has the same function as the claimed altered sequence, it has the structure disclosed in the specification as altered.

Thus, Johnson *et al.* anticipate the claimed invention.

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myron G. Hill whose telephone number is 571-272-0901. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*MAK*  
Myron G. Hill  
Patent Examiner  
6/5/07

*Bruce Campbell*

BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600